

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated May 5, 2005, Applicants have amended the specification so as to correct several translation errors made when the instant application was translated from the corresponding Japanese application. Claims 1 and 7 have also been amended so as to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in Figs. 3 and 4, and at page 17, line 13 to page 19, line 16 of the specification. No new matter has been added.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art references.

II. The Rejection Of Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by USP No. 6,512,543 to Kuroda. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in-part that the reset signal supplied from the reset signal supply means outputs to pixels provided within an effective pixel area and dummy pixels that are provided in an area other than the effective pixel area.

In accordance with one exemplary embodiment of the present invention, a reset signal for the electronic shuttering operation is supplied to an arbitrary i^{th} row (where $1 \leq i \leq m$) included in the effective pixel area while a readout operation is performed on another row. For example, while a readout operation is performed on the m^{th} row, resetting for the electronic shuttering operation can be performed on the $(m+3)^{\text{rd}}$ row. Accordingly, the resetting for the electronic shuttering operation

is activated not only for the effective pixel area but is also activated for a dummy pixel that is provided in an area other than the effective pixel area. As a result, the reset potentials resulting from the electronic shuttering operation can be desirably equalized among the pixels within the imaging section so as to eliminate the horizontal noise resulting from such electronic shuttering operation.

In the pending rejection, the Examiner expressly acknowledges that Kuroda does not disclose that the pixels are classified into a group of imaging pixels that are provided within an effective pixel area and a group of dummy pixels that are provided in an area other than the effective pixel area (see, page 7 of Office Action). In this manner, it is evident that the alleged reset signal of Kuroda is *not* output to the pixels provided in an effective pixel area *and* the dummy pixels provided in an area other than that of the effective pixel area. It should also be noted that Wang (USP No. 4,862,276) does not cure this defect of Kuroda, because Wang expressly discloses that the row scanning shift register SR' only outputs the signals Q_1 to Q_m to the corresponding rows of $R_1 - R_m$ of the array 29, and does *not* output any signal to the dummy pixel Rd (see, col. 12, lines 48-51).

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each element of the claim in issue be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference, *Kalman v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 781 (Fed. Cir. 1983), and at a minimum, Kuroda fails to disclose the foregoing claim elements, it is clear that Kuroda does not anticipate claim 1 or any of the claims dependent thereon.

III. All Dependent Claims Are Allowable Because The Independent Claims From Which They Depend Are Allowable

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are

Application No.: 09/417,097

contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as claim 1 is patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also in condition for allowance.

IV. Conclusion

Accordingly, it is urged that the application is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/AHC/dlb
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 4, 2005